

b) detecting specific binding, thereby identifying a ligand.

Sub B1  
9. The method of claim 8 wherein the library is selected from DNA molecules, RNA molecules, peptide nucleic acids, mimetics, peptides, and proteins.

Sub B2  
18. (Once Amended) A method of screening a sample from a patient for an immune response, disorder, condition, or disease, the method comprising:

a) contacting the sample with the composition of claim 1 immobilized on a substrate under conditions to allow formation of a hybridization complex;

A3  
b) quantifying complex formation; and

c) comparing complex formation with a standard, wherein a change in the amount of complex formation indicates the presence of the immune disorder, condition, or disease.

19. The method of claim 18, wherein the immune disorder, condition, or disease is a pro-inflammatory disorder selected from viral infections, rheumatoid arthritis, insulin-dependent diabetes mellitus, multiple sclerosis, encephalomyelitis, inflammatory bowel disease, psoriasis, and pemphigus vulgaris.

A3 Sub B3  
20. (Once Amended) The method of claim 18, wherein the immune disorder, condition, or disease is an anti-inflammatory disorder selected from bacterial and parasitic infections, allergies and other atopic disorders, chronic graft versus host disease, scleroderma, and systemic lupus erythematosus.

#### REMARKS

Applicants have canceled claims 2-5 and 10-17 without prejudice to renewal. Applicants reserve the right to prosecute these non-elected claims in subsequent divisional applications. Applicants have amended claims 1, 7, 8, 18, and 20 as shown above to place them in condition for allowance. Claim 1 has been amended, and the response has been written to reflect that the elected invention is a combination. Applicants again point out that SEQ ID NO:219 was reluctantly elected as a representative novel polynucleotide of the combination. No new matter was introduced by the amendments to the claims.

Applicants respectfully request that methods claims 8 and 9 which fall within the scope of claim 1 be recombined as provided under the Commissioner's Notice in the Official Gazette of 26 March 1996, entitled, "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 USC § 103(b)" which sets forth the rules, upon allowance of product claims, for rejoinder of process claims covering the same scope of invention.

#### CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 USC § 101

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 6-7, and 18-20 under 35 USC § 101 because the claimed invention lacks patentable utility. The Examiner has stated that: